



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/595,824

05/15/2006

Christophe Colignon

PSA0313828

7288

29980

7590

09/15/2008

NICOLAS E. SECKEL

Patent Attorney

1250 Connecticut Avenue, NW Suite 700

WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TU MINH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3748

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/15/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/595,824	Applicant(s) COLIGNON, CHRISTOPHE	
	Examiner TU M. NGUYEN	Art Unit 3748	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 March 2008 and 11 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 May 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's Amendments filed on March 3 and June 11, 2008 have been entered. Claim 1 has been amended; and claims 9-16 have been added. Overall, claims 1-16 are pending in this application.

Applicant's argument that Morimoto et al. fail to disclose an oxidation catalyst-forming means implementing an OSC function (page 9 of the March 3, 2008 Amendment), is not persuasive. The examiner, however, introduces a new ground of rejection to further clarify the rejection. Therefore, a new non-final rejection is set forth below.

Drawings

2. The formal drawings filed on May 15, 2006 have been approved for entry.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 8 is objected to because on line 2 of the claim, "from" should read --from at least one of--; and on line 5 of the claim, "and/or" should read --and--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office Action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 2, 7-10, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morimoto et al. (U.S. Patent 6,708,487) in view of Itoh et al. (U.S. Patent 6,769,245).

Re claims 1 and 9, as illustrated in Figures 1 and 4-7, Morimoto et al. disclose a system and a method for assisting the regeneration of depollution means (12) associated with oxidation catalyst-forming means (11) and integrated in an exhaust line (30) of a motor vehicle diesel engine, in which the engine is associated with common rail means (not shown but obviously must have in order to feed fuel to each fuel injector (42)) for feeding its cylinders with fuel, the system comprising means (55, 56) for analyzing the running conditions (value of injection fuel quantity, engine speed) of the vehicle and for comparing (in step S11) them with predetermined threshold values (the values of injection fuel quantity and engine revolution or speed outside the Continuously Regenerable Area in Figure 4), to control the engine in a first regeneration mode of operation with a lean mixture when running conditions are above the threshold values (when the engine is in the Continuously Regenerable Area, a normal lean operating condition of the engine is maintained to regenerate the particle filter (12) (also see lines 50-63 of column 7)).

Morimoto et al., however, fail to specifically disclose that the oxidation catalyst-forming means (11) implements an OSC function that constitutes a supply of oxygen.

As shown in Figure 1, Itoh et al. disclose an exhaust gas apparatus of a diesel internal combustion engine, comprising a particle filter (22) carrying an active oxygen release agent. As depicted in Figures 4A and 7B and indicated on lines 58-65 of column 6 and lines 51-60 of column 12, Itoh et al. teach that it is conventional in the art to utilize an oxidation catalyst (platinum) in conjunction with the particulate filter, wherein the oxidation catalyst has a function

Art Unit: 3748

to store oxygen ions on its surface and is adapted to oxidize NO in an exhaust gas with the stored oxygen ions to produce NO₂ which is used to promote combustion of the soot trapped by the particulate filter. Since Morimoto et al. also utilize an oxidation catalyst-forming means that has the exact functions as those by the oxidation catalyst in Itoh et al., it is at least obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made, to realize that the oxidation catalyst-forming means in Morimoto et al. implements an OSC function that constitutes a supply of oxygen.

Re claims 2 and 10, in the system and method of Morimoto et al., the depollution means comprise a particle filter (12).

Re claims 7 and 15, in the system and method of Morimoto et al., the engine is associated with a turbocharger (21, 31).

Re claims 8 and 16, in the system and method of Morimoto et al., the running conditions are determined from at least one of the load (injection fuel quantity) on the engine and its running speed (engine revolution or speed).

6. Claims 3; 4, 6; 11; and 12, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morimoto et al. in view of Itoh et al. as applied to claims 2; 1; 10; and 9, respectively, above, and further in view of Asanuma et al. (U.S. Patent Application 2002/0007629).

Re claims 4 and 12, the system and method of Morimoto et al. disclose the invention as cited above, however, fail to disclose that the depollution means comprise a NO_x trap.

As shown in Figure 18, Asanuma et al. disclose a device for purifying an exhaust gas of a diesel internal combustion engine, comprising a particle filter (70). As depicted in Figure 22 and

Art Unit: 3748

indicated in paragraphs 0091-0092, Asanuma et al. teach that it is conventional in the art to include a NO_x trap and a noble metal catalyst on both sides of a partition wall (54) in the particle filter so that the filter is adapted to remove and purify harmful NO_x emissions in the exhaust gas. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made, to have utilized the particle filter taught by Asanuma et al. in the system and method of Morimoto et al., since the use thereof would have been routinely practiced by those with ordinary skill in the art to remove and purify harmful NO_x and particulate matter emissions in an exhaust gas stream.

Re claims 3, 6, 11, and 14, in the modified system and method of Morimoto et al., the depollution means are impregnated with an SCR formulation (NO_x absorbent and noble metal catalyst), performing a function of oxidizing CO/HC.

7. Claims 5 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morimoto et al. in view of Itoh et al. as applied to claims 1 and 9, respectively, above, and further in view of Rao (U.S. Patent 4,655,037).

The system and method of Morimoto et al. disclose the invention as cited above, however, fail to disclose that the fuel includes an additive that is to be deposited together with the particles with which it is mixed on the depollution means in order to facilitate regeneration thereof.

Rao discloses a carbon ignition temperature depressing agent and a method of regenerating a particle filter utilizing the agent. As indicated on lines 30-42 of column 3 and line 58 of column 3 to line 14 of column 4, Rao teaches that it is conventional in the art to include an additive (metal oxide) in an engine fuel so that the additive is deposited together with the

Art Unit: 3748

particles with which the additive is mixed on a particle filter in order to facilitate regeneration thereof by reducing an ignition temperature of the particles. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made, to have utilized the additive taught by Rao in the system and method of Morimoto et al., since the use thereof would have been routinely practiced by those with ordinary skill in the art to save fuel or electricity by reducing an ignition temperature of the particles.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to the references applied in the previous Office Action have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Communication

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Tu Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4862.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Thomas E. Denion, can be reached on (571) 272-4859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TMN

September 12, 2008

/Tu M. Nguyen/

Tu M. Nguyen

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3748